



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,639	09/28/2000	Gary Dan Dotson	00AB154	7884
7590	07/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Allen-Bradley Company Inc			WANG, JIN CHENG	
Attention: John J Horn			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Patent Dept/704P Floor 8 T-29			2672	
1201 South Second Street				
Milwaukee, WI 53204			DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/672,639	DOTSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jin-Cheng Wang	2672	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 25 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-14,22-27 and 29-35.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____

Continuation of 3. NOTE: 1) Applicant's amendment will not overcome the 112 rejection set forth in the Final Rejection as new issue arises from the applicant's amendment and arguments. Applicant argues on Page 9 of Remarks that neither Tjandrasuwita nor Reddy, et al. teach providing the selected pixel data to a single output over a single interface for both CRTs and LCDs as claimed. However, from Page 9 of applicant's specification, it is stated that the raster engine is thus programmable to support many different and disparate display types over the same digital interface by formatting and routing color data to the appropriate PINS on the interface, which may include a parallel output. The different PINS or the parallel output indicate that the pixel data are routed to different outputs instead of "A SINGLE OUPUT over a single interface" as claimed, i.e., the pixel data must be routed to different outputs in order to be displayed on display devices of disparate types including LCD displays and CRTs. Moreover, it is also stated in Page 9 of applicant's specification that the raster engine may further comprise an integrated digital to analog converter to support analog LCD displays and CRTs. This is the same hardware that Tjandrasuwita used to route the pixel data to DAC in order for the pixel data to be displayed on the analog LCD displays and CRTs. It is impossible to use the same output to route pixel data to both digital display devices and analog display devices. Therefore, it is simply impossible to have the single output for providing the digital pixel data or the analog pixel to both CRTs and LCDs. The above observation in view of applicant's argument raises a new issue of 112 rejection that the claim limitations set forth in the claim 1 will not overcome the 112 rejection set forth in the Final Rejection and the Advisory Action of this Office Action.



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600